



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

only fair success, but nevertheless with the incidental advantage of giving the inventor definite data for the design of the *Clermont*. He did not approach the latter problem either by inspiration or guess-work. A ship was definitely planned on tolerably exact information. This method seems to have been typical of Fulton, and his great-granddaughter has represented him truthfully not only in what she has herself written, but also in what she has taken from his letters. Another fact is frankly admitted. He was not the originator of the idea of propulsion by steam. Others had tried it and failed. He was the first to build and operate a steamboat successful commercially from the very beginning.

The nation owes him a debt of gratitude therefore as a designer and builder, a man with a rare combination of imagination, boldness, and technical knowledge. Mrs. Sutcliffe has indicated this so clearly by quotations from other writers that she leaves us in no doubt. One closes the book and its inspiring collection of Fulton's own productions with regret and with the wish that more were to follow.

Robert Y. Hayne and his Times. By THEODORE D. JERVEY, Second Vice-President of the South Carolina Historical Society. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pp. xix, 555.)

ACCOMMODATING himself to the dearth of intimate materials upon Hayne's life and the wealth of data upon the general history of South Carolina embodied in the newspaper files and pamphlet collections of the Charleston Library, Mr. Jervey has devoted his book more to the times in South Carolina and particularly in Charleston, and to the course of federal politics upon the state-rights issue, than to a detailed narrative of Hayne's doings. In fact the book is principally a chronicle of Charleston affairs from 1791 to 1839, with Hayne's career a recurring rather than a continuous theme. In many portions the account is colorless; but at many points a penchant of the author appears. He takes or makes very many opportunities to lay stress on the meritorious deeds of Charles Pinckney and to quote laudatory notices of William Lowndes, and, on the other hand, to make derogatory remarks concerning Calhoun. The author is a Charlestonian of the strictest loyalty and tends to celebrate Charlestonian talent and merit as represented in Pinckney, Lowndes, and Hayne. He characteristically considers that Calhoun, a non-Charlestonian, has been magnified at Hayne's expense and that it is part of his duty to right the wrong. In several matters Mr. Jervey points out errors in Hayne's views, but in the great instance of variance between Hayne and Calhoun in 1830-1832, as to the basis of state sovereignty, he labors zealously but without happy result to support Hayne's position. Hayne in his reply to Webster spoke of the federal compact as made and existing between the several states and the central government, with sovereignty vesting in each of the parties. Calhoun, rejecting this,

contended that the states alone were sovereign and in creating the union had established the central government as an agent which possessed no sovereignty. Mr. Jervey (pp. 293-295) says that this would have been the case had the states by their action of 1787-1789 established a union *de novo*, but that it was not true in fact because what had been done in 1787-1789 was merely to revise and make more perfect the "perpetual union" already existing by virtue of the old Articles of Confederation. To support this view he cites the resolution adopted by the South Carolina assembly in 1787 appointing delegates to the Philadelphia convention, which authorized them to join in the revision of the Articles, to be effective upon the approval of the central government then existing and of the several states. "This", says Mr. Jervey, "seems to bear out the idea of the constitutional compact which both Webster and Calhoun thought erroneous, when advanced by Hayne; namely, that the general government was a party to the compact." As a matter of fact, however, the delegates from South Carolina and the other states did not use their authority to make the existing compact more perfect, but to draft a radically new constitution, ignoring the amending machinery of the old and providing for the new to become effective upon its ratification by nine states. The Congress of the Confederation, furthermore, did not ratify the new constitution, but merely referred it to the several states for submission to conventions. Accordingly, if the compact theory of the Union is to be held at all, and states' rights based thereon, it must be Calhoun's theory of a compact between the states, and not Hayne's theory of a compact between the central government and the several states.

The high lights in Hayne's career as given by Jervey are his several speeches in the Senate, in 1824 on the tariff, in 1827 on the Colonization Society, and in 1830 in reply to Webster, his gubernatorial proclamation of 1832 in reply to Jackson's threat of coercion, and his champion-ship of the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad project in the closing years of his life. Each of these principal episodes the author treats in the main admirably; but in several instances he overstates his case, as when he endorses Hayne's neck-or-nothing policy in promoting the Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad on the ground (p. 531) that if the plan had succeeded and the railroad had been built its operation would have made the Northern and Southern people so much better acquainted with one another that the Civil War might well have never occurred. This argument is hardly short of fantastic. Again (pp. 80, 81), he exaggerates the importance of the repeal in 1818 of the law which had prohibited the importation of slaves from other states into South Carolina. The federal censuses show that the average rate of increase of the negro population in South Carolina between 1810 and 1860 was substantially smaller than that of the negroes in the United States at large. This indicates that South Carolina was in that half-century more of a slave-exporting than a

slave-importing state, and that a prohibition of slave imports would have had no appreciable influence upon the ratio of increase of her negro population.

The style of the book is unpolished and the narrative overladen with details and digressions. But the amateur quality of the work is itself not unattractive. The book affords a relief from the monotony of that school of American historical writers who walk ever in trodden paths. The author has rendered a valuable service in describing South Carolina developments and in presenting the career of one of her truest sons, eloquent, upright, devoted, and lovable. We shall hope for further historical work from Mr. Jersey's pen.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1907. Volume II., Part I. *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas.* Edited by GEORGE P. GARRISON, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Texas. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1908. Pp. 646.)

TEXAS was for a time the most critical diplomatic battlefield of Christendom. The publication of her correspondence has therefore been a historical desideratum of no little consequence, and one has great reason for thankfulness in taking up the first of the two volumes which are to present it, edited by a scholar better qualified than any one else for his task and put forth by the American Historical Association in excellent form. The contents of the volume are in general the correspondence with the United States down to the close of 1842; and among the subjects upon which light is thrown are the internal condition of Texas, the characters and purposes of her public men, her relations with the government and the Federalists of Mexico, her southern and her northern boundary difficulties, her Indian troubles, the moral and material assistance drawn from the United States, the Santa Fé expedition and its sequel, the questions of postal arrangements with the United States and fugitives from justice, American relations with Mexico and action in behalf of Texan independence, the treaty of amity, navigation, and commerce with this country, political conditions here, the motives and aims of our statesmen, and—above all other subjects—the questions of recognition by this government and annexation to our Union. After a chronological list of the documents, an introduction which indicates how official relations between the two countries were established and whence the documents have been obtained, and a needful list of the oft-changing Texan officials, comes a very useful Calendar of Correspondence Hitherto Printed. Here it was doubtless found difficult to adopt a logical rule of inclusion. One finds, for example, a letter from ex-President Jackson to an anonymous American (p. 39) and a note from the Mexican minister to Calhoun (p. 45), but not Webster's highly im-